

REMARKS

Claims 1-60 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 11, 15, 20, 21, 27, 31, 35, 47, 51, 55 and 60 have been amended. No claims have been canceled, and no new claims have been added. Claim 61 was canceled previously in a response to an earlier office action.

Disclaimers Relating to Claim Interpretation and Prosecution History Estoppel

The claims of this application are intended to stand on their own and are not to be read in light of the prosecution history of any related or unrelated patent or patent application. Furthermore, no arguments in any prosecution history relate to any claim in this application, except for arguments specifically directed to the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The final office action rejected claims 1-5, 7-19, 21-25, 27-39, 41-45, and 47-59 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cho et al (US 6,834,048 B1) and Bertacchi (US 5,790,638). The final office action rejected claims 6, 20, 26, 40, 46 and 60 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Cho/Bertacchi and Musk et al (US 6,185,194 B1). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The independent claims (claims 1, 11, 21, 31, 41 and 51) have been amended to more clearly recite patentable features. Namely, the following limitations recited in the claims are not found in the cited references:

Claims 1, 21 and 41:

[...] a call trigger in accordance with the instructions in the search response, the call trigger to initiate a multi-leg phone call with a user telephone associated with the user phone number and a merchant telephone associated with the merchant phone number, the user telephone and the merchant telephone separate and distinct from each other and separate and distinct from the computing device.

Appl. No. 10/821,467
Amdt. Dated 9/27/2006
Response to Office action dated 08/08/2006

Claims 11, 31 and 51:

instructions for triggering a multi-leg phone call with the merchant phone number and a user phone number associated with a user telephone separate and distinct from the server and the computing device

None of the cited prior art references teach or suggest, in whole or in part, alone or taken together, the amended limitations quoted above. As such, the independent claims are patentable over the cited references.

By virtue of their dependency on the independent claims, the dependent claims are patentable over the cited references for the reasons cited above. As such, the dependent claims are patentable over the cited references by virtue of their dependency on the independent claims.

Appl. No. 10/821,467
Amdt. Dated 9/27/2006
Response to Office action dated 08/08/2006

Conclusion

It is submitted, however, that the independent and dependent claims include other significant and substantial recitations which are not disclosed in the cited references. Thus, the claims are also patentable for additional reasons. However, for economy the additional grounds for patentability are not set forth here.

In view of all of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested and allowance at an early date is solicited.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney to answer any questions or to discuss steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark Andrew Goldstein
Reg. No. 50,759

Date: September 27, 2006

SoCal IP Law Group LLP
310 N. Westlake Blvd., Suite 120
Westlake Village, CA 91362
Telephone: 805/230-1350
Facsimile: 805/230-1355
email: info@socalip.com